REMARKS

Claims 58-70, 74-76, 78, 79, and 81-83 are pending. Claims 58-70, 74-76, 78, 79, and 81-83 were rejected. Claims 58, 69, 70, 76, and 81 have been amended. Support for the claim amendments may be found in the as-filed application in at least page 9, lines 15-17; page 12, lines 17-27; and page 15, lines 21-24. No new matter has been added.

Claim Objections

Claim 81 was objected to for informalities noted in the Office Action. In light of the amendments to claim 81, it is respectfully submitted that the objection should be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 81 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. In light of the amendments to claim 81, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 58-70, 74-76, 78, 79, and 81-83 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,592,609 to Suzuki et al. (Suzuki) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,315,666 B1 to Mastera et al. (Mastera). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections in view of the following.

As amended, claim 58 recites a "gaming program shared object and the bonus gaming program shared object [that] are functional units of game code that provide different feature sets of the same computerized wagering game, and wherein each of the plurality gaming program shared objects is configured to provide a feature set for a plurality of computerized wagering games controlled by the computerized game controller."

Implementations of the features recited in claim 58 may provide, "a shared object architecture that allows individual game objects to be loaded and to call common functions

provided by a system handler application." (Applicants' specification; page 8, lines 7-9). The disclosed shared object architecture may reduce "the amount of effort required to evaluate and review new game designs by gaming regulators, because the amount of code to be reviewed for each game is reduced by as much as 80% over known, machine-specific architecture." (Applicants' specification; page 8, lines 1-4).

Among other things, Suzuki describes a game processor console including a floppy disk that stores an operating system and model software that may be used to fabricate a video game. (Suzuki; Col. 5, lines 20-37). The language cited in the Office Action describes "[a] command routine portion of the operating system [that] includes subroutines that perform actual operations based on instructions from the kernel and [a] peripheral driver section of the operating system [that] includes subroutines that handle access to the various peripherals as described above." (Suzuki; Col. 27, lines 48-50). Thus, according to Suzuki, a subroutine may perform operations based on instructions from the kernel of an operating system. The kernel, as described in Suzuki "interprets commands, manages memory, reads in transient operating system portions and starts up command routines." (Suzuki; Col. 27, lines 41-43).

While the operating system subroutines described by Suzuki "handle access to various peripherals" (Suzuki; Col. 27, lines 51-52), they are not described in Suzuki as "functional units of game code that provide different feature sets of the same computerized wagering game," as recited in claim 58. As discussed above, the operating system subroutines may "perform actual operations based on instructions from the kernel." (Suzuki; Col. 27, line 49). However there is no disclosure or suggestion in Suzuki that they may "provide a first feature set of a computerized wagering game," as recited in claim 58.

Furthermore, the operating system subroutines described by Suzuki are not believed to "provide a feature set for a plurality of computerized wagering games controlled by the computerized game controller," as recited in claim 58. According to claim 58, a single gaming program shared object may "provide a feature set for a plurality of computerized wagering games." While an operating system subroutine may "handle access to various peripherals" (Suzuki; Col. 27, lines 51-52), they do not appear to be able to "provide a feature set for a plurality of computerized wagering games controlled by the computerized game controller," as recited in claim 58. Accordingly, the Office Action has not shown that Suzuki reasonably

discloses or suggests the features recited in claim 58.

Mastera fails to cure the deficiencies of Suzuki with respect to claim 58. Mastera describes gaming machines having a secondary display for providing video content. The system disclosed in Mastera may further comprise a graphics controller and video RAM storing video data corresponding to displayed video content. The language cited in the Office Action describes a system controller determining when video data should be provided to a graphics controller. (Mastera; Col. 13, lines 10-13). The graphics controller may then control the display of the content on the LCD display in accordance with an animation. (Mastera; Col. 13, lines 13-15).

While Mastera represents a significant advance in gaming machine displays and methods, Mastera only references data associated with a wagering game in the context of displaying audio and video data associated with the wagering game. Mastera is silent regarding an operating system, a system handler application, or gaming program shared objects within a wagering game program. Thus, Mastera is not believed to reasonably disclose or suggest a "gaming program shared object and the bonus gaming program shared object [that] are functional units of game code that provide different feature sets of the same computerized wagering game, and wherein each of the plurality gaming program shared objects is configured to provide a feature set for a plurality of computerized wagering games controlled by the computerized game controller," as recited in claim 58.

Accordingly, Suzuki alone or in combination with Mastera fails to render independent claim 58 obvious, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claims 76 and 78 recite features similar to that of claim 58 and are patentable for similar reasons. Dependent claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency. As such, allowance of claims 58-70, 74-76, 78, 79, and 81-83 is earnestly solicited.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants believe that all pending claims are allowable over the art relied upon and respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would

expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, including any extension fees, which may be required or credit any overpayment directly to the account of the undersigned, No. 504480 (Order No. IGT1P369/SH00052-001).

Respectfully submitted,
Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP

/John F. Griffith/
John F. Griffith
Reg. No. 44,137

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(510) 663-1100
JFG/nkt